Forbidding *Forbidden* A Feasible Crosslinguistic Universal?

Uli Sauerland uli@alum.mit.edu

Leibniz-Centre General Linguistics (ZAS), Berlin, Germany

Searching for semantic universals in the modal domain Workshop on the universals in modal and attitudinal semantics University of Leiden – December 14, 2018

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

Suggestions today

- stating the suggested FF universal
- parallels: forbidding no and antonyms

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

possible sources of evidence for FF

Stating the FF-Universal

FF (Forbid 'Forbidden') Any primitive concept *m* of type $\langle st, st \rangle$ in any language is isotone (i.e. if $p \subseteq p'$, then $m(p) \subseteq m(p')$)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ ● ●

Some immediate issues:

- Don't conditionals restrict modals?
- Can't not be of type (st, st)?
- Are deny, reject primitive concepts of type (est, est)?

Two Parallel Proposed Universals

Determiners:

NN (No 'no') Any primitive concept d of type $\langle et, ett \rangle$ in any language is isotone in its scope (i.e. if $s \supseteq s'$, then $d(r)(s) \rightarrow d(r)(s')$; cf. Sauerland 2000, Penka 2011).

Adjectives:

AA (Anti-antonym) For any degree dimension D, any primitive concept a of type $\langle d, t \rangle$ must be isotone (i.e. if d > d', then $a(d) \rightarrow a(d')$; cf. Heim 2006, Kayne 2006, Büring 2007, Moracchini 2018).

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ ● ●

Sources of Evidence

cross-linguistic absence of non-isotone lexical items: NN: absence and/or decomposition of 'no' AA: asymmetries between positives and antonyms FF: ?

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

- L1 acquisition generalizations: NN: argument for learning difficulty AA & FF: ?
- others: e.g. artificial grammar learning

NN: Absence of 'no' 1

Languages with no lexical item for 'no': Japanese (Yabushita 1996), Salish (Matthewson 1998)

Japanese:

Sono hon-o yonda gakusei-wa hitori-mo inai. that book read students one-even exist-not 'Students who read that book don't exist.' *(literally)*

'No students read that book.'

Salish:

a. xwa kwet syaqcu-s (Sechelt) neg THING wife-his
'His wife didn't exist.' (*literally*)

'He had no wife.'

b. 7axw ti ka lhalas 7ala 7ats (Bella Coola) NEG DET HYP boat here
'A boat doesn't exist here.' (literally)
'There's no boat here.'

Negative concord languages:

a. Non o visto nessuno (Italian) Non have seen nobody

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ □ のへぐ

- 'I saw nobody.'
- b. *o visto nessuno have seen nobody

NN: Decomposition of 'no'

Possible analyses of 'no' / German 'kein':

- generalized quantifier: $[no] = \lambda R \lambda S.R \cap S = \emptyset$
- decomposed: 'no' = silent 'not' + 'some'

weil keine Bespiele bekannt sein müssen (German) because no examples know be must

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

(not \gg must \gg some)

Absence of antonyms (e.g. Kayne 2006):

English: deep / shallow. French: profond / peu profond

Explanation of Bierwisch asymmetries:

How tall is he? She is as tall as him How short is he? She is as short as him.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

FF: Candidate morphemes for negative modals

Negative modals (Veselinova 2013) from 105 languages:

modal/att.	# languages	example
not know	27	Siona, French
not able	18	Ojibwe, Korean
not want	17	Kwaza, Slovene
not need	4	Tetun

Prohibitives: two (optional) parts in Teiwa (Klamer 2010)

Ha-dan na-pak-an gaxai. 2s-part 1s-call-REAL do.not 'Don't call me' (Lit. 'Your obligation is not to call me')

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

NN: L1 acquisition

Katsos *et al.* (2016): Unterstanding of positive and negative quantifiers by 5 year olds from 31 languages, two relevant generalizations:

- generalization 1: isotone quantifiers easier (all, some) than antitone ones (no, not all) explanation: primitive concepts >> composed concepts

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

(cf. Deschamps et al. 2015)

Outlook

- general constraint on antitonic meanings: FF, NN, AA
- explanation: scalar structure?
- Feasible implicature based generalizations:
 - no weak necessity without strong necessity
 - no modals with actuality entailments unless there non-actuality modals

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三 のへぐ